



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,945	02/10/2006	Constantinos D. Diakoumakos	HAM 830015	4563

63067 7590 11/13/2008  
HUNTSMAN ADVANCED MATERIALS AMERICAS INC.  
LEGAL DEPARTMENT  
10003 WOODLOCH FOREST DRIVE  
THE WOODLANDS, TX 77380

EXAMINER
----------

MC CULLEY, MEGAN CASSANDRA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/13/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/567,945

**Applicant(s)**

DIAKOUMAKOS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Megan McCulley

**Art Unit**

1796

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 February 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa et al. (US 2002/0040098) in view of Eichorst et al. (US 2001/0019813) in further view of December et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,471,843).

Regarding claims 16, 21, 22, 23, and 24: Maekawa et al. teaches a composition comprising a cyclocarbonate group (para. 49), particles/platelets of clay (para. 79) and a hardener/crosslinking agent (para. 55).

Maekawa et al. does not teach the platelets having a thickness of less than 25 angstroms or an aspect ratio of higher than 10. However, Eichorst et al. teaches a polyurethane composition (abstract) comprising clay platelets of montmorillonite (para. 43) with a thickness of about 0.001 micron and a diameter of 0.050 microns (para. 43). This is calculated to 10 angstroms thick and an aspect ratio of 50. Maekawa et al. and Eichorst et al. are combinable because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely urethane based compositions filled with clay particles. At the time of the invention a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to combine the specific clay particles of Eichorst et al. with the composition of Maekawa et al. and would have been motivated to do so for such desirable properties as increased electrical conductivity and optical transparency as stated by Eichorst et al. (para. 25).

Further, Maekawa et al. does not teach a non-isocyanate based polyurethane. However, December et al. teaches a non-isocyanate based polyurethane (col. 2 lines 43-52). Maekawa et al. and December et al. are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely chemical resistant adhesive compositions. At the time of the invention a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to combine the non-isocyanate polyurethane of December et al. with the composition of Maekawa et al. and would have been motivated to do so for such desirable properties as decreased environmental concerns, as evidenced by December et al. (col. 2 lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 17: Maekawa et al. teaches an epoxy group (para. 49).

Regarding claim 18: Maekawa et al. teaches the reaction of cyclocarbonate and carbonyl groups (para. 49), which would make  $R_1$  and/or  $R_2$  an unsaturated oxygen containing group.

Regarding claims 19 and 20: Maekawa et al. does not teach the amount of the clay particles. However, Eichorst et al. teaches from 20-80% particles in the polymer binder (para. 29), which overlaps the claimed range. At the time of the invention a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to combine the amount of particles of Eichorst et al. with the composition of Maekawa et al. and would have been motivated to do so for such desirable properties as sufficient electrical conductivity properties while still maintaining effective adhesive properties.

Regarding claim 25: Maekawa et al. comprises fiber reinforcement (para. 86).

Regarding claim 26: Maekawa et al. teaches a pigment (para. 76).

Regarding claim 27: Maekawa et al. teaches a stabilizer (para. 76).

Regarding claim 28: Maekawa et al. teaches solvent (para. 76).

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa et al. (US 2002/0040098) in view of Eichorst et al. (US 2001/0019813) in view of December et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,471,843) as applied to claim 16 above and in further view of Wulf von Bonin (U.S. Pat. 3,827,869).

Regarding claim 29: Maekawa et al. teaches the basic claimed composition as set forth above.

Not disclosed is a diluent. However, Wulf von Bonin teaches a composition comprising a polyurethane, clay particles (col. 2 line 45), and cyclic carbonate (col. 5 line 54) with diluents. Maekawa et al. and Wulf von Bonin are combinable because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely compositions comprising cyclic carbonates and clay particles. At the time of the invention a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to combine the diluent of Wulf von Bonin with the composition of Maekawa et al. and would have been motivated to do so for such desirable properties as an easily workable and apply-able uncured composition that can cure without release of volatile solvents.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa et al. (US 2002/0040098) in view of Eichorst et al. (US 2001/0019813) in view of December et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,471,843).

Regarding claim 30: Maekawa et al. teaches mixing (para. 80) a composition and curing (para. 90), the composition comprising a cyclocarbonate group (para. 49), particles/platelets of clay (para. 79) and a hardener/crosslinking agent (para. 55).

Maekawa et al. does not teach the platelets having a thickness of less than 25 angstroms or an aspect ratio of higher than 10. However, Eichorst et al. teaches a polyurethane composition (abstract) comprising clay platelets of montmorillonite (para. 43) with a thickness of about 0.001 micron and a diameter of 0.050 microns (para. 43). This is calculated to 10 angstroms thick and an aspect ratio of 50. Maekawa et al. and Eichorst et al. are combinable because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely urethane based compositions filled with clay particles. At the time of the invention a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to combine the specific clay particles of Eichorst et al. with the composition of Maekawa et al. and would have been motivated to do so for such desirable properties as increased electrical conductivity and optical transparency as stated by Eichorst et al. (para. 25).

Further, Maekawa et al. does not teach a non-isocyanate based polyurethane. However, December et al. teaches a non-isocyanate based polyurethane (col. 2 lines 43-52). Maekawa et al. and December et al. are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely chemical resistant adhesive compositions. At the time of the invention a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to combine the non-isocyanate polyurethane of December et al. with the composition of Maekawa et al. and would have been motivated to do so for

such desirable properties as decreased environmental concerns, as evidenced by December et al. (col. 2 lines 1-10).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Megan McCulley whose telephone number is (571)270-3292. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on (571) 272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Eashoo/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/M. M./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1796